

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MICHAEL EUGENE WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

KARI SIDERITS,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:23-cv-258

HON. JANE M. BECKERING

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Michael Eugene Williams initiated this *pro se* action on March 13, 2023 with the filing of a Complaint (ECF No. 1). Defendant Kari Siderits filed a motion to dismiss (ECF No. 5). The matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge, who issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R), recommending this Court grant Defendant's motion and dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for failure to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's objection to the Report and Recommendation.

This Court is required to make "a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." *Id.*; *see also* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3) ("The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to."). This Court's Local Rules require any party objecting to a Report and Recommendation to "specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations

or report to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.” W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b); *see also Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995) (holding that “objections disput[ing] the correctness of the magistrate’s recommendation but fail[ing] to specify the findings ... believed [to be] in error” are too general).

Plaintiff’s “objection” demonstrates his misunderstanding of the Magistrate Judge’s conclusion but does not demonstrate any error in the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. Plaintiff’s objection, therefore, is properly denied inasmuch as it provides no grounds for review—let alone rejection—of the Report and Recommendation. Accordingly, this Court denies the objection and adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation as the Opinion of this Court. A Judgment will be entered consistent with this Opinion and Order. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 58.

Therefore:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Objection (ECF No. 9) is DENIED and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 8) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to dismiss (ECF No. 5) is GRANTED.

Dated: June 28, 2023

/s/ Jane M. Beckering
JANE M. BECKERING
United States District Judge